


Appl. No. 09/939,095  
Amdt. dated August 18, 2005  
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2005

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis for the term "the presentation object." While Applicants believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would find claim 1 to be clear and thus comply with § 112, second paragraph, Applicants request the above amendment be made to the claim to moot the rejection. This rejection does not raise new issues, does not require additional searching and merely puts the claims in better form for appeal. Applicants have already filed a Notice of Appeal to contest the art rejections of the claims.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Jonathan M. Harris  
PTO Reg. No. 44,144  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400